

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for removing the objection to replacement Figure 1 as submitted with the previous response.

Applicant notes what is apparently a typographical error in the first paragraph of page two of the Office Action, which states that claims 3-4 have been cancelled. In the Reply of July 5, 2005, Applicant did not cancel claims 3 and 4. Instead, claims 1, 3-5, 8, 9, 11-13, 16-17, 19-21, 23, 24, 27-29, and 33 are currently pending.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, 8, 9, 11-13, 16-17, 19-21, 23, 24, 27-29, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,313,848 to Hoag ("Hoag") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0100509 of Sommerer et al. ("Sommerer"). Applicant traverses.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner must factually demonstrate that (1) Hoag and Sommerer disclose or suggest each and every element recited in the claims; (2) there is a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention by modification of the teachings of Hoag in view of Sommerer, and (3) there exists some suggestion or motivation, either in the references itself or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify Hoag or combine the teachings of Hoag and Sommerer to produce the claimed invention. See M.P.E.P. §§ 2142, 2143 (8th ed., May 2004 rev.).

Furthermore, each of these requirements must be found in the prior art – not in Applicants' own disclosure. See *id.* The Office Action fails to demonstrate at least two of these requirements.

The Office Action does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because Hoag does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claims, and Sommerer

does not cure this deficiency. For example, independent claim 1 recites “creating a first window and a second window,” “displaying the first portion of the data for the list item in the first window,” and “displaying the second portion of the data for the list item wrapped into the second window.” The other independent claims recite similar features related to a first window and a second window.

Hoag, in contrast, teaches a method for displaying, in a single window on a computer display screen, tabular data arranged in rows and columns, where the single window is divided into panes, and each pane contains a different segment of columns from the tabular data. (Abstract, col. 2, lines 1-11; Figs. 5 and 6). Hoag teaches the uses of a single window divided into two panes, but does not teach or suggest the use of first and second windows, as recited in claim 1. Hoag never mentions the use of multiple windows to display tabular data, and in fact states that its principle objective is to use only one window: “It is a principal object of the present invention to allow a computer user to view an entire wide record of tabular data, displayed as a row in a single window, with reduced or eliminated need for horizontal scrolling.” (Col. 2, lines 8-11).

The Examiner admits that Hoag does not disclose utilizing a first and second window to display wrapped list item data, as recited in the claims. (Office Action at 3). The Examiner alleges that Sommerer cures this deficiency. (Id.) Applicant disagrees because Sommerer also teaches using only a single window to display data that is reformatted to fit the width of the window.

Specifically, Sommerer teaches a system that reformats a web page so that it will fit, without scrolling in more than one dimension, on a display screen that the web page

was not designed for. (Abstract, paras. 5, 19, 21, 27, 30, 38, 42). For example, Sommerer teaches reformatting a web page designed for a 17-inch-wide personal computer display screen so that the web page objects fit on the 2- or 3-inch-wide screen of a cell phone or PDA, eliminating the need for horizontal scrolling. (Paras. 2, 3, 13, 38, 42). To do this, Sommerer teaches reformatting a line of text, or other display object that is too wide to fit on a small screen, by either shortening each line so it fits into the width of the display or shrinking the display elements (e.g., making text font smaller or reducing the size of a picture) so that they are only as wide as the target device display screen. (Id.; para. 27).

Thus, Sommerer does not teach the use of multiple windows, as the Examiner asserts. Instead, Sommerer teaches reformatting the web page information so that it fits into a single window that takes up the entire display of a handheld device. (Id.). Indeed, one of ordinary skill would recognize that it would be impractical, if not impossible, to open and effectively read and use two or more windows on the tiny display screen of a handheld device such as a PDA or cell phone.

In the Office Action, the Examiner referenced Figure 1 and the accompanying text of Sommerer as disclosing “utilizing a first and second window to display the data.” (Office Action at 3). The Examiner, however, misunderstood Figure 1 because the specification of Sommerer explains that Figure 1 depicts the same, single window shown at three different times after performing horizontal scrolling operations. In particular, “FIG. 1 illustrates three parts of a web page 100 as shown on a handheld device at different horizontal scroll points.” (Sommerer, para. 3).

The composite display 100 is configured to illustrate how a web page, which is typically designed for display on a

desktop or laptop display screen, may not adequately fit within the dimensions of a handheld device display screen 102. In fact, as can be seen on the depiction of three handheld device displays arranged side by side, the web page visualized on FIG. 1 horizontally straddles the combined width of three displays.

(Sommerer, para. 23).

Thus, FIG. 1 of Sommerer and the accompanying text do not teach or suggest displaying the second portion of the data wrapped into the second window, as the Examiner mistakenly asserted, but instead disclose conventional horizontal scrolling of a single window to display a text line that is too long to fit in the width of the display screen. Sommerer contains no teachings or suggestions related to utilizing a first and second window to display a web page.

For at least the reasons stated above, Sommerer does not disclose or suggest creating a first window and a second window based on the determination that data for a list item cannot be displayed within the width boundary, displaying the first portion of the data for the list item in the first window, and utilizing a first and second window, or displaying the second portion of the data for the list item wrapped into the second window, as recited in claim 1. The other independent claims recite similar elements. Consequently, neither Hoag nor Sommerer, whether taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose all the elements recited in independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 24, and a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Thus, these claims are allowable over the cited references.

Applicant further submits that claims 3-5, 8, 11-13, 16, 19-21, 23, 27-29, and 33, which depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 9, 17, and 24, are also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. These claims also recite additional features which

are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections of all these claims.

For example, Hoag does not disclose each and every limitation recited in claims 3, 11, 18, and 27 and Sommerer does not cure this deficiency. Claim 3, for example, recites “[t]he method for displaying data of claim 1, wherein the data for a list item comes from more than one data source.” One example of the data for a list item coming from more than one data source is shown in the embodiment of Figure 5 described on page 17 of the specification:

In this embodiment, two or more data sources, such as database 540 and website 550, are logically linked together or otherwise associated for purposes of displaying their data as a list of items on a display 500. As shown, the system displays the data from records in database 540 in columns 511, 512, 513, and 514 in display area 510, wrapping into columns 515 and 516 in display area 520. The system also displays the data from website 550, which is received via the Internet 530, as a wrapped continuation of the database 540 data items in columns 521, 522, and 523.

Hoag, in contrast, teaches displaying data from only a single data source, such as a single spreadsheet or a single database. Hoag makes no mention or suggestion of more than one data source, as recited in claim 3 and similarly recited in claims 11, 18, and 27. Nor does Sommerer. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 11, 18, and 27 are allowable over Hoag and Sommerer for this additional reason.

Hoag also does not disclose each and every limitation recited in claims 4, 12, 19, and 28, and Sommerer does not cure this deficiency. Claim 4, for example, recites “[t]he method for displaying data of claim 1, wherein displaying the second portion of the data further comprises: displaying at least one column of data from the first portion in the second window.” One example of displaying a column of data from the first portion

in the second window is shown in the embodiment of Figure 2 of the present application. As the specification explains on page 8, “[I]n this embodiment, the display aids the user in comprehending which rows in the two display areas correspond to each other by keeping the first column “Queue Name” 230 in display area 210 the same as the first column “Queue Name” 231 in display area 220.”

As the Examiner points out, Hoag teaches using “header columns” 522 and 523 to display row labels (showing rows designated by numbers 1 through 10) for each visible row in the upper pane 511 and the lower pane 512 of the window in Figure 5 to illustrate that pane 511 and pane 512 are displaying different columns of the same rows. (Col. 4, line 63 - col. 5, line 7). The numbers 1-10 are merely convenient labels, however, and not “data from the first portion” of the list item, as recited in claims 4, 12, 19, and 28. Hoag makes no mention or suggestion of displaying a “column of data” from one table segment in a pane that displays another table segment. Nor does Sommerer. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 as well as claims 12, 19, and 28 are allowable over Hoag and Sommerer for this additional reason.

Furthermore, Hoag does not disclose each and every limitation recited in claims 8, 16, 23, and 33, and Sommerer does not cure this deficiency. Claim 8, for example, recites “[t]he method for displaying data of claim 1, further comprising: handling an event associated with the first window such that the event synchronously affects the second window.” In one exemplary embodiment described in the specification on page 8, “events, such as selecting a row, selecting a column, sorting, refreshing, etc., in either of the two display areas are executed synchronously in both display areas using conventional synchronous event handling techniques.”

As discussed above, Hoag teaches only a single window, as does Sommerer. Without teaching two windows, Hoag and Sommerer cannot teach or suggest “an event associated with the first window such that the event synchronously affects the second window.” In the Office Action, the Examiner cites to Figure 6 of Hoag as disclosing this feature. Since the Examiner did not elaborate, and the drawing does not show an event, Applicant does not know what event or feature the Examiner is referring to. The text of Hoag makes no mention of events associated with Figure 6. In any case, Applicant submits that any event associated with the window shown in Figure 6, even it affects both panes of the window, still affect only a single window. Thus Hoag does not teach “that the event synchronously affects the second window,” as recited in claims 8, 16, 23, and 33, because there is no second window in Hoag. Sommerer makes no mention or suggestion of an event associated with a first window, or of a second window. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8, 16, 23, and 33 are allowable over the prior art for this additional reason.

In addition to not demonstrating that the references disclose or suggest each and every element of the claims, the Office Action also does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness because it does not factually demonstrate a reasonable expectation of success for producing the claimed invention by modifying the teachings of Hoag in view of Sommerer. The disclosures of Hoag and Sommerer both utilize a single window to solve the horizontal scrolling problem. Therefore, combining these references cannot reasonably be expected to successfully produce a two-window solution, as recited in the claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 21, 2005

By: William J. Brogan
William J. Brogan
Reg. No. 43,515